

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY



To:
OHTSUKA, Yasunori

7th FL., SHUWA KIOICHO PARK
BLDG., 3-6, KIOICHO, CHIYODA-KU,
Tokyo 1020094 Japan

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	26. 4. 2005
-------------------------------------	-------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference
P205-0047WO

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No. PCT/JP2005/003824	International filing date (day/month/year) 01.03.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 03.03.2004
--	--	--

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
Int.Cl.⁷ H04N1/41

Applicant
CANON KABUSHIKI KAISHA

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Date of completion of this opinion		07.04.2005	
Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP Japan Patent Office 3-4-3, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-8915, Japan		Authorized officer	5V 4237
		Minoru MATSUNAGA Telephone No. +81-3-3581-1101 Ext. 3571	

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/003824

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/003824

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 5, 6, 11, 12, 17

because:

☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____
relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. _____
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☒ the claims, or said claims Nos. 5, 6, 11, 12, 17 are so inadequately supported
by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☒ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. 5, 6, 11, 12, 17.

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the
Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form ☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form ☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing do not comply with the technical requirements
provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions in that the computer readable form:

☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the technical requirements

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/003824

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>4, 10, 16</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-3, 7-9, 13-15</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	<u>1-4, 7-10, 13-16</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-4, 7-10, 13-16</u>	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations

D1:JP 6-291991 A (Matsushita Graphic Communication Systems, Inc.)
1994.10.18, fig36, [0002-5], fig2[0020-30] & US 5574834 A1 & US 005787239
A1

D2:JP 2001-27986 A (Canon Kabushiki Kaisha) 2001.01.30, fig30, 31
[0124-129] & US 6587735 B1

The subject matter of claim 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 do not meet the requirement of novelty.

D1 discloses code converting units have one-to-one correspondence to the request-source task units. (fig36, [0002-5])

D1 discloses code converting units, the number of which is smaller than the number of the request-source task units, and assigning unit assigns said code converting units in a prescribed order to the processing requests from the request-source task units. (fig2[0020-30])

The subject matter of claim 4, 10, 16 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of the D1 and D2 cited in the ISR.

D2 discloses code converting units are constituted by software implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/003824

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

In the description page 16 line 6 - page 18 line 23, it is only described that the actual processing is executed solely by the hardware-implemented code processing units or the software-implemented code processing units, and description of the description page 9 line 9 - page 10 line 1 is not clear enough to define technical feature.

Therefore, claim 5, 6, 11, 12 and 17 are not supported by the description as required by Article 6 PCT.